

NO 2 - REQUEST FOR REVIEW: BA25008 / Amin Valji

Filed By:

Caitlin and Brad Peters

Deadline for RFRs:

September 8, 2025

Date RFR received:

September 4, 2025

Status of Party as per Decision Summary:

Directly Affected Parties

This is a letter to appeal the approval of application number BA25008. My name is Caitlin Peters this letter is written on behalf of also Bradley Peters, and our 4 children also residing at the residence of 55026 Range Road 271, Sturgeon County, Alberta.

I am just not convinced that the proper research has been done. There are two other locations of KUKU farm sites in the area where these issues have risen for the surrounding homeowners. And yet we are just being told it will be fine. It will not be.

Our main concern with the application and this project going forward was the increase in traffic on our RANGE ROAD 271- This was not addressed at all in approval. It was mentioned HWY 37 traffic. As well stating that only 7 feed trucks and 5 egg trucks would increase the traffic is a false statement on behalf of the applicant. Is there any proof that they would be only picking up the product basically once a week? What about workers going to the site daily? This information became a concern brought to us from neighbors that live near another location in the county. And it is a main concern for them. Their road is unsafe with the heavy traffic and truck presence, as well as the workers “ hitchhiking” down their roads. Terrible road conditions in the spring due to the large truck tires and muddy roads. Extreme dust in all summer. It was stated that the NRCB does not require road use agreements for the applicant. Then who does? If this is a main concern and safety hazard how does this get resolved?

Value of homes decreasing. The value of the homes will decrease in the area. But again, it is stated that the NRCB does not consider home value. Then who does, and why not??

Odor and flies. YES they will increase. Proven again by a neighboring location. The smell is unbearable to them. On a hot summer night cannot even open a window. Flies increased. But again, the applicant responded this won't be an issue. At the other location down the road the birds are placed in a pile to decompose then spread over the fields. But at this location they are going to be placed in a biosafe container which will be taken away for rendering? Has this been proven - or are we just taking the word for it? And what do we do when it is a huge issue after it has been stated it wont be?

Community Impact. The concern with the community impact was not addressed. It was asked how this KUKU farms company is going to contribute to the community? Community values and core is important to the residents. All that was discussed was the distance from the school. But I will guess that this is not in the NRCB's jurisdiction. But remains a concern for the community.

Even these “ small” concerns were basically overlooked and responded to as “ No it will be ok” How can we trust that the research into environmental impacts were also studied and found not to affect the area residents. Considering the large amount of feedback that was received against the application I would really hope this is reconsidered and denied. The area residents do not want this to happen.

As well a lot of the concerns like the road, property values, animal, disposal, community impact disease concerns were stated to not be in the NRCB's jurisdiction therefore it is approved? This does not make sense.